THE EFFECT OF USING *CALL* AND TASK-BASED LEARNING IN TEACHING GRAMMAR FOR THE 10TH YEAR STUDENTS OF SMK INFORMATIKA UTAMA

Sodikin

Abstract

The research is aimed to find out whether or not the use of CALL was significant in teaching grammar for the tenth year students of SMK. This research was done in the second semester to the tenth grade of SMK Infromatika Utama Depok, there are two classes involved and each class consisted of 30 students. The data was obtained by doing the pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was done to know that the grammar ability from both classes was same, and post-test was done to know the effect of treatment has been given to the students. The data was counted by using t-test in SPSS 17 for windows, and must be > 0.05 because it is the minimum score to show the effectiveness of the treatment. After doing the research, the findings of the research concludes that the effectiveness of using CALL method in teaching grammar has a great percentage of outcome and it can be used in teaching grammar for the tenth year students of SMK. In other words, there is a great effect to the students in understanding the grammar after the implementation of the teaching program. Based on the research, it can be stated that CALL method is great to use for teaching grammar for the tenth year students of SMK, and it is suggested for the teachers to apply CALL for teaching and learning grammar. However, all teachers should comprehend in using and operating the computer and other facilities that owns by the school for teaching and learning grammar.

Key words*: Teaching grammar, task-based learning, CALL*

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Nowadays, the most important aspect of language learning is how to express the ideas fluently in the target language in order to be understood by native speakers. To reach this aim, foreign language learners should know how to use different words and phrases in sentences. In other words, students should be familiarized with the grammatical points in the target language which have been overlooked in the recent years. Grammar learning and speaking are two significant poles in foreign language acquisition. Grammatical competence is an umbrella concept that includes increasing expertise in grammar (morphology, syntax), vocabulary, and mechanics with regard to speaking, the term mechanics refers to basic sounds of letters and syllables, pronunciation of words, intonation, and stress.

Students' difficulties in learning English grammar, commonly found as low of the students' comprehension in the way to use or completely answer the Englishgrammar questions in the test, formative test or summative test and also in thenational examination.In order to have an effective learning and teaching program in which allstudents achieve at high levels of English grammar, the student's role must be defined as a high achieving learner. Therefore, it needs many resources and ways to make the process of teaching and learning activities run smoothly.

Some of good schools have implemented new ways of teaching and learning using information technology (IT), and computer –assisted learning language (CALL). They have been used to support changes in teaching and learning techniques. Nowadays, every teacher should have more than one way in teaching. TBL, however, is one of good technique in teaching and learning process, such as learning language. The TBL is one of many approaches in language learning. The term approach refers to theories about the nature of language and language learning that serves as the source of practices and principles in language teaching (Richards and Rodgers, 2001:20).

The TBL approach is presented by some of its proponents (Willis, 1996) as a logical development of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. Task-based learning is a learning approach based on activities/tasks, where learners use the TBL for a communicative purpose in order to achieve a real outcome (Willis, 1996).

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of CALL and TBL in teaching grammar. Several previous theories have addressed the issue of CALL and TBL literacy among students, typically through pre-test and post-test given in a semester.

B. The identification of the problem

The Study compared between CALL and TBL learning English grammar into experiment class and control class.Which one from those methods is better, or both of them are good for students.

Based on the background above, the identification of the problem are:

1. The students' understanding in grammar is average, so it needs more creative way from the teacher to teach it by using both computer and Task.
2. The teacher is not creative to use atechnique such as a computer in teaching grammar

3. The teacher only uses the monotonous way to teach grammar, so it makes students bored.

C. The Limitation of the study

In this research the writer purposes is to investigate the effects of using computer – assisted learning language (CALL) and TBL in teaching grammar(Simple present tense and Conditional Sentences type I) for tenth year students of SMK Informatika Utama - Depok.

D. The Research Questions

Based on the research statement above, the research questions are:

1. Does CALL work more effective than TBL in students' mastery of grammar?
2. Do students taught by CALL gain better mastery in grammar than those taught by using TBL?

E. The Objectives of the Study

Based on the identification of the problem above, the main objectives of this research are to:

1. To find out the evidence of CALL and TBL in improving students' mastery of grammar.
2. To find out which one is more effective to be used in improving the student's mastery of grammar.

F. The Significance of the Study

This research is expected to give some contribution to the English teachers. Thus, it might accordingly affect and improve the quality of education and professionalism of teachers in teaching, especially in teaching English. To other people, this research is expected to give the information how to use CALL and TBL for teaching.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Review of Related Literature

In recent years, computers have become so widespread in schools and homes that their uses have to be re-examined. According to Warschauer (1998), the development of CALL is

divided into three main phases, behaviorist CALL, communicative CALL, and integrated CALL.

Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is the learning involving the utilization of the computer, usually by mean of the interactive – computer system which reflect in language learning (Hartoyo: 2006). Teaching grammar will be more effective if teachers use this program.

The use of tasks in language pedagogy has a long tradition, particularly in the 'communicative approach' to language teaching. In fact, in the late 1970s and 1980s, these tasks were often called 'communicative activities' (Crookes, 1986). The term 'communicative activities' has been gradually replaced by 'tasks' (Bygate et al., 2001). The interest in tasks comes from the belief that they are "a significant site for learning and teaching" (Bygate, 2000: 186). The early research efforts focused on investigating the potential of the task as a unit of organization in syllabus design or language instruction (e.g., Harper, 1986; Candlin and Murphy, 1987; Prabhu 1987; Breen, 1987, 1989; Long and Crookes, 1993; Willis, 1996 among others).

B. Theoretical Framework

a. Grammar

Grammar is part of this resource. But the relation of grammar to other parts of the linguistic system is not a part to whole relation; rather, it is a symbolic one. Grammar is a resource for creating meaning in the form of wordings.

Grammar can be characterized as a set of rules that, taken together, yield a natural language (such as English). (Surely, beyond the morphological and syntactic rules, this set also comprises phonological rules, among others.) but these rules are party of our tact (subconscious), rather than explicit (conscious) knowledge. Thus, any native speaker is able to tell whether a positive negative statement.

b. CALL (Computer-Assisted Learning Language)

CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning) is the term most commonly used by teachers and students to describe the use of computers as part of a language course (Kocak, 1997). Computer-assisted language learning is a form of computer-based assisted learning with two important features: (1) bidirectional learning and (2) individualized learning. It is not a method. CALL materials are tools for learning. The focus of CALL is learning, and not teaching. CALL materials are used in teaching to facilitate the language learning process. It is

a student-centered, self-paced learning material, which promotes accelerated learning (Alkan, 1997; Hardisty and Windeatt, 1989; Kocak, 1997; Levy, 1997).

It is therefore concluded that CALL is an approach to language teaching and learning in which computer technology is used as an aid to the presentation, reinforcement and assessment of material to be learned, usually including a substantial interactive element.

c. Task-based learning (TBL)

TBL is a natural extension of communicative language teaching (Harmer, 2007: 51). This method concerns on the students' activities then language itself. TBL's syllable shape in the list of activities in the community like student's daily activities, school environment etc. Students pushed to make observation and use their experience about anything around them. They learn to and have an opportunity to describe their own opinion, do the role playing or telling the other about the certain information.

Based on the statements above, it can be concluded that TBL can improve students' comprehension in grammar, and students can learn and have a chance to tell others about anything by using their own opinion.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Method

1. Research Design

This study applied a quasi-experimental design by using non-randomized and no-equivalent control group pre-test since the goal of the study is to investigate the effectiveness of certain method. This design was used because the limitation of time and school regulation. Besides, it is used due to impracticable random assignment of school and classroom (Kerlinger, 1970 in Cohen and Manion, 1994: 169). The research design is depicted as follows:

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
Experimental (A)	√	X	√
Control (B)	√	X	√

2. Variables

There are two variables in this study. The first is independent variable which is CALL and TBL in learning grammar. The second is dependent variable which is the tenth year students of Smk Informatika Utama Depok

B. Population and Sample

This study didn't use therandom sampling techniques because there are only two classes in the tenth year students of SMK Informatika Utama – Depok.Each class is consisting of 30 students which are selected as the sample for this study. All the students are involved as experiment of the present study. To insure consistency in methodology, the test was done as morning classes that are held twice a week every Monday and Friday for about a month.

C. Research Procedure

The procedure of the study consisted of several steps. The first step was organizing the teaching procedure in experimental and control group. The second step was organizing the research instruments. The research instrument used in the study was grammar test. Then the grammar test was polit-tested and analyzed in order to find out the validity, reliability, difficulty index and discrimination index of the instruments. The third step was administering pre-test. The fourth step was organizing the lesson. The fifth step was administering post. All of the data which were obtained from pre-test and post-test were analyzed based on the data analysis procedure.

D. Data Collection

1. Validity

Validity and reliability of the test determine whether or not the test is appropriate as the research instrument. Since the items of the test were developed based on the course objectives of teaching grammar in Indonesian context, it can be said that has content validity.

2. Reliability

Reliability is the extent to which test procedures consistent result when administered under similar condition (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 244).After obtaining reliability of the half of the test. Spearman-Brown is used to find out reliability of the whole test. Then, the reliability of the test was verified through the criteria of reliability.

3. Index of Difficulty

A good test is a test which contains items which are not too difficult and also are not too easy. Heaton (1995:178) states that the index of difficulty or facility value (FV) of an item illustrates how easy or difficult the certain item established in the test.

4. Discrimination Index

According to Heaton (1995:179), the discrimination index of an item indicates the extent to which the item distinguishes between the testees, separating the more able testees from the less able. The index of discrimination (D) tells us whether students who do well on the entire test tend to do well or badly on each item of the test.

E. Research Instruments

The instrument is pre-test and post-test. In detail, the research instrument in this study can be explained as follows:

1. Pre-test

Pre-test was given to experimental group and control group to find out the initial ability of student's grammar. The items that were used as research instrument consist of twenty five multiple choice items.

2. Post-test

Post-test was given to find out whether there is any difference between the experimental group and control class as a result of the treatment. The items of the test were same as with those in pre-test.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

a. Pre-test Score Analysis

Pre-test was conducted on January 13, 2012, to both experimental and control groups. The pre-test is conducted in order to measure the students' ability in grammar before the treatments.

b. Normality distribution test

Normality distribution test is calculated by using Kolmogrov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk. The test is conducted to check whether the pre-test scores of both groups are normally distributed. Moreover, Field (2005:93) argues that Ho is accepted when the normal distribution is > 0.05. The result of normality distribution of the data is presented in table below.

Normality Distribution of the data in pre-test

Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
PRE TEST Experimental	.129	30	.200*
Control	.124	30	.200*

The table presents that the significance value (Asymp.Sig) of the experimental and control classes are normally distributed, and the null hypotheses (H_o = the scores are normally distributed) is accepted (0.200 > 0.05).

c. The homogeneity of variance test

The homogeneity test was used to analyze whether the variance score of the experimental and control group are homogenous (Coolidge, 2000:143).

Test of Homogeneity of Variance in pre-test

Pre-test Based on	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Mean	.755	1	58	.388

The table presents that the significance value (0.388 > 0.05). it means that the null hypotheses (H_o = variance of experimental and control groups are homogenous) is accepted (Field, 2005.

d. Post-Test Score Analysis

Post-test was conducted on February 10, 2012. The post-test was given to measure their grammar ability after they received the treatments.

e. Normality of distribution test

Analysis of normality distribution test in the post-test was same as the analysis of normality distribution in the pre-test. The following table presents the result of normality distribution test:

Table 4.4

Experimental and Control Groups in Post-test

Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
POST TEST	.104	30	.200*
Experimental	.148	30	.092
Control			

The calculation from SPSS 17.0 for windows presents that the significance value of the experimental group from Kolmogorov-Smirnov is 0.2 and of the control group is 0.092. From the result above, it can be seen that both of classes have sig. Value higher than the level of significance (0.05). It means that the null hypothesis is accepted.

f. The homogeneity of variance test

Levene Statistics in SPSS 17.0 for window was used to calculate the variance homogeneity

Test of Homogeneity of Variance in Post-test

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
POSTTEST based on Mean	3.744	1	58	.058

Table presents that the Asymp.sig is 0.058, it is higher than the level of significance (0.058 > 0.05). it indicates that the null hypotheses is accepted. It shows that the variance of control and experimental groups' score is homogenous (Field, 2005).

g. The improvement between pretest and posttest of experimental group

The scores of pre-test and post-test were analyzed by using paired-sample t-test in SPSS 17.00 for windows

Paired samples statistics of pre and post test experimental group

	pretest	postest
Mean	42.80	77.07
N	30	30
Std. Deviation	10.235	11.504
Std. Error mean	1.869	2.100

Paired sample *t*-test of pre and post test experimental group

	Paired Differences					*t*	df	Sig (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% confidence Interval Difference				
				Lower	Upper			

Pair 2 preTest-Post Test	32.800	11.622	2.122	37.140	28.460	15.459	29	.000

Table presents that the value of $t_{obtained}$is higher than $t_{critical}$ value on the table (15.459 > 2.045) with level significance 0.5 and df = 29. The result means that the null hyphotheses (H_0) is rejected. Thus, it could be stated that there is a significant difference of improvement in grammar between the pre-test mean and the post-test mean.

h. The improvement between pretest and postest of control group

It needs to indicate that there is significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores after the treatments.

The paired sample statistics of pre and post test control group

	pretest	postest
Mean	44.27	62.00
N	30	30
Std. Deviation	11.174	16.601
Std. Error mean	2.040	3.031

	Paired Differences							
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% confidence Interval Difference		*t*	df	Sig (2-tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 preTest-PostTest	19.200	14.342	2.618	24.555	13.845	7.333	29	.000

Paired samples *t*-test of pre and post control group

Table presents that the value of $t_{-obtained}$is higher than $t_{-critical}$ value on the table (7.333 > 2.045) with level significance 0.5 and df = 29. The result means that the null hyphotheses (H_1) is accepted. Thus, it could be stated that there is a significant difference of improvement in grammar between the pre-test mean and the post-test mean.

i. Comparing the improvement Means of experimental and control groups

Group statistics of postest of experimenal and control group

	Posttest of experimental	Postest of control
Mean	77.07	62.00
N	30	30
Std. Deviation	11.504	16.601
Std. Error mean	2.100	3.031

Independent sample *t*-test of postest of experimental and control group

The table presents that the $t_{obtained}$ is higher than $t_{critical\ value\ on\ the\ table}$, (4086 > 2.000). Regarding to this finding, the result discovers that the null hyphotheses is rejected (Coolidge, 2000). In short, it could be summarized that there is significant difference between the post-test means for the control and experimental classes.

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
	F	Sig.	*t*	df
POSTTEST Equal variances assumed	3.744	0.58	***4.086***	58
Equal variances not assumed			***4.086***	51.633

j. The effect size of the treatments

The effect size calculation was aimed to know the value of treatment's effect to the students' score. The calculation was performed manually using the correlation coefficient of effect size (Coolidge, 2000:151). The data were taken from $t_{obtained}$ in independent *t*-test in post-test ($t_{obtained}$ = 4.086 and df = 58).

$$r = \sqrt{\frac{4.086^2}{4.086^2 + 58}}$$

$$r = 0.519$$

Comparing the *r* value of the research represents a large effect size. In other words, the treatments gave a large effect to the students' score in the experimental group (Coolidge, 2000:151).

B. Discussion

The use of interactive program in teaching grammar is important to have a great result in implementing the material to the students. The present study is the effect of using CALL and Task-Based Learning in teaching grammar for the tenth year students of SMK Informatika Utama Depok.

It is clear that before we want to create the data, so we have to ensure that the data is normal and homogenous. Somehow, either in pre-test or post test needs the normality and the homogeneity test. Based on data analysis, it is undoubtly that the data was normally distributed and the variance scores of both experimental and control class are homogenous because its significance is higher than the level of significance (0.05). It can be inferred that the data is coming from the normal and homogenous data.

Teaching technique constitute a significant part of the instructional process. While some students (experimental class) are stimulated by using Call and another class (control class) uses TBL to accomplish the same purpose which is learning grammar. In hence, the mean in pre-test both experimental and control class got less than level of significant (0.05). Meanwhile, the mean after treatments got higher of level significant (0.05), those means scores indicates that there is significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores after the treatments.

Somehow, the comparison of the improvement means of experimental and control class is counted by using independent *t*-test, it is used to check the improvement of mean between the experimental and control class' score. Regarding to the finding, the result discovers that H1 is accepted because t-observed is higher than t-table (4.086 > 2.000). in short, it could be summarized that there is significant difference between the post-test means for the control and experimental class.

It was also found that the effect size (r value) gave a large effect to the students' score in the experimental class who used CALL as the media to teach grammar because it has higher score than the large of effect size (0.519 > 0.371). Based on the data above, it can be concluded that the students who used CALL in learning grammar are better than they who used TBL. This is in line with some theoretical review of the related literatures in chapter two where by using CALL program the teachers can eager student interactions and stimulate students which perhaps will enhance learning achievement (Ahmad, et al, 1985; Tong-Fredricks, 1984; Higgins and Johns, 1984; Sanders and Kenner, 1983; Underwood, 1984; Wyatt, 1984; Jones, 1986; Higgins, 1986). In other words, teaching grammar will be more effective and interactive if teachers use CALL.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

The findings of the research concludes that The effectiveness of using CALL in teaching grammar has a good result of outcome and it can be used in teaching grammar for the tenth

year students of SMK. Based on the questions from the chapter I. Thus, the computation of *t*-test on post-test shows the t obtained> critical (4.086 > 2.000), meaning that the H1 is accepted. In other words, it can be concluded that there is significant difference result between experimental class which is using CALL and control class which is using Task-based Learning after treatments. Moreover, the effect size shows that there is a great effect of CALL in teaching grammar K with r value = 0.519.

The comparison between both of techniques (CALL and TBL) has differences based on *t*-Test formula which used SPSS 17.0, and it has different result outcome dealing with score instrument. Experimental group with 77.07 and Control group with 62.00 stated that experimental group has a higher level outcome.

Based on the findings, it can be stated that the use of using CALL can give an effective way in students' mastery in grammar.

B. Suggestions

From the findings above the researcher has some suggestions for the teachers about using CALL in teaching and learning activity, as follows:

1. CALL is better than TBL, so it is suggested for the teachers to apply CALL for teaching and learning grammar.
2. CALL is more effective and it can motivate students on learning grammar
3. Schools have to provide the complete facilities of computer and internet.
4. Teachers have to be able to operate the computer and the program as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmad, K. et al. 1985. *Computers, Language Learning and Language Teaching* Cambridge: Cambridge University

Alkan, B. 1997. *The Investigation of the Comparision of Computer-Assisted English Language Learning and Teacher-Centred English Language Teaching*. Izmir: Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu

Anzel, et al, 1992. *Learning linguistics with Computer*: Hypertext as a key to linguistics networks. Literacy and Linguistic Compting Journal

Arimurti, Dian. 2007. *CALL (Computer-Assisted Learning Language) is new ways in developing teaching material*. The report applied from education seminar at Muhammadiyah University: Ponorogo, 12 September 2007.

Barson, J. & Debski R. 1996. Calling *back CALL: technology in the service of foreign language learning based on creativity, contingency, and goal-oriented activity*. In

Warschauer M. (ed.) *Telecollaboration in foreign language learning*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Brown J.D. 1990. *The Use of Multiple T-Tests in Language Research*, TESOL Quarterly**.**

Brown, H. D. (2001) *Teaching by Principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (second edition) New York: Longman

Borg & Gall, 1979. *Educational Research: an introduction.* New York: Longman, Inc

Cora, Lindsay and Paul Knight. 2006. *Learning and Teaching English*. Oxford: Oxford UP,Print.

Coolidge. L. Frederick. 2000.. *A Statistics of Gentle Introduction*. London: Sage Publication

Chapelle, C. 1990. *The Discourse of Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Toward a Context for Descriptive Research.*TESOL Quarterly.

Crystal. David. 1995. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of The English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

D. Bolinger. 1977. *Meaning and Form*. London: Longman.

D. Willis and Willis Jane. *Doing Task-based Teaching*. Oxford UP, 2007. Print

Ehsani, F. and Knodt, E. 1998. *Speech Technology in Computer-Aided Language Learning: Strenghts and Limitations of a New CALL Paradigm*. Language Learning and Technology.

Everest, Mount – Definitions from Dictionary.com (Based on the Random House Unabridged Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2006).

Field, A. P. 2005. *Discovering statistics using SPSS: and sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll* (second edition). London: Sage publications.

G. N. Leech, 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *How to Teach English, Saffron Walden UK :Pearson Longman*, (2nd impression).

Hartoyo. 2006. .*Individual differences in Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. Semarang: Pelita insani.

Hatch, Evelyn & Farhady, H. 1982. *Research Design and Statistic For Applied Linguistics.* Los Angeles:Newburry.

Heaton J.B.1995. *Writing English language tests.* Harlow: Longman.

Higgins, J. 1986. The computer and grammar teaching. In Leech, G. And Candlin, C.N. (Eds). *Computers in English Usage teaching and research*. New York: Longman Group Limited. Pp. 31-45.

Higgins, J., & Johns, T. 1984. *Computers in Language Learning*. Co-Published by London: Collins ELT; Reading: Addison Wesley.

Hinrichs, Erhard, 1986. *Temporal anaphora in discourses of English.* Linguistics and Philosophy 9.

J. H. McMillan. 2000.*Examining categories of rival hypotheses for educational research*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. P.69

Jones, G. 1986. Computer simulations in language teaching the kingdom Experiment. System, 14(2), 179-186.

K Kitao & Kitao, S. K. 2001. On-line resources and journals: *ELT, linguistics, and communication*.http:// ilc2.doshisha.ac.jp/users/kkitao/online/

Kocak, N.C. 1997. *The Effectiveness of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) in Vocabulary Instruction to Turkish EFL Students.* Ankara: Bilkent University Institute of Economics and Social Sciences.

Kroeger, Paul. 2005. Analysing Grammar: An Introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 32

Liang, M. and Bonk, C. J. 2000. Interaction in Blended EFL Learning: Principles and Practice. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning.*

L. Cohen, and Manion, L.1994.*Research Methods in Education*. London, Routeledge and Kegan Paul

M, Celce-Murcia. 1991. *Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching*. TESOL Quarterly. 3(25): 459-480.

M.A.K. Halliday, and Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Arnold: p6.

Noam Chomsky. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Nunan, David. 1989.*Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, Print

Pardiyono, M.Pd. 2005. *Pasti Bisa! Teaching Genre-Based Writing*. Yogyakarta: Andi.

Pius, T.H. 2003. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning and the Revolution in Computational Linguistics*. Linguistic Online

Pyle, M.A and Munoz, M.E 1987. *Preparation Guid*e. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons

Richards, J.C and Rodgers, T. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rogers.Jack C. 1999. *Influencing Skills*. London : Marshall Publishing

Rogers, J. 2001. *Adults Learning 4Ed*. (London: Open University Press. England

Ross, Margaret. 1992. The CHILL factor (or computer hindered language learning. AW: 65-66

Sanders, D. and Kenner, R. 1983. *Hypermedia in the teaching of Italian.* Calcio Journal, 10 (4), 76-82.

Smith, Carlota S., 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect.* Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Swan**,** M. 1980. *Practical English Usage.* Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Tong-Fredericks, C. 1984. *Types of oral communication activities and the language they generate: a comparison.* System, 12, 133-145

Underwood, John H. 1993. The Lab of the future: Using Technology to Teach Foreign Language. *Community College Journal. August/September* 64(1), 33-39.

Warschauer, M. 1996. *Computer Assisted Language Learning: an Introduction*. In Fotos S. (ed.) *Multimedia language teaching*. Tokyo: Logos International

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (2000). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach.* The People's Education Press, Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, and Cambridge University Press.

Willis, J. 1996. *A Framework for Task-Based Learning.* Longman

Wyatt, David H. 1984. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Instruction.* Great Britain: Pergamon Press Ltd.

Wren and Martin. 1990. *High School English*. Grammar and Composition. New Delhi : Ram Nagar.